



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,761	05/05/2006	Liquan Zhang	B-5958PCT 623441-1	1739
36716	7590	11/29/2008		
LADAS & PARRY 5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			EXAMINER EL-ZOOBI, MARIA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/578,761

Applicant(s)

ZHANG ET AL.

Examiner

MARIA EL-ZOOBI

Art Unit

2614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 15-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2, 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recite the limitation "wherein the models between the conference coordination systems and the" is not clear, because "the model" indicates that this "model" has been mentioned before, however there is no "models between the conference..." mentioned before

Claim 4 recites "the multipoint communication data in the multipoint communication module comprises" is not clear, because "the multipoint communication data" is not mentioned before, claim 2 only recites a multipoint communication module for communicating with the subordinate conference management system and the neighboring conference coordinating system, this limitation is not clear weather this data is being transformed to or created by the multipoint communication data.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the corresponding master and slave conference management systems", is not clear because this limitation has not mentioned before and only a corresponding management systems is mentioned in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Jinsong (CN 02118792).

Regarding claim 1, Jinsong discloses, a videoconference system (Pg. 2, lines 1-3), comprising:

terminals (Pg. 2, lines 3-4 and Fig. 3, el. 9-12)

multipoint control units as the superior level for the terminals (Fig. 3 and Pg. 2, line 5-6) for controlling the corresponding terminals to participate in the videoconference (Pg. 2, lines 5-6 and Pg. 23, lines 9-11)

conference management systems as the superior level for the multipoint control units (Fig. 3, el. 6-7 and Pg. 2, lines 6-7; Primary GK) for managing resource allocation of the corresponding subordinate multipoint control units to meet subscribers' demand (Pg. 8, lines 4-5) and performing conference dispatching and control for the local

conference site (Pg. 8, lines 4-18, Pg. 12, lines 18-22) and

conference coordination systems, as the superior level for the conference management systems (Fig. 3, el. 2-3 and Pg. 2, lines 7-8) for coordinating corresponding subordinate conference management systems and the neighboring conference coordination systems to perform dispatching and control for the entire conference at a dispatching request (Pg. 11, Pg. 12, lines 1-6 and Pg. 37, lines 17-24).

Regarding claim 14, Jinsong discloses, a videoconference system management (Fig. 1-3) method, comprising
the steps of:

- 1) the subscriber requesting for conference dispatching from the home conference management system (Pg. 3, lines 6-8)
- 2) the home conference management system managing the corresponding local conference site directly at the dispatching request, and transferring the dispatching across conference management systems to the corresponding conference coordination system (Pg. 3-4) and
- 3) the conference coordination system dispatching the corresponding master and slave conference management systems at the dispatching request (Pg. 3-4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jinsong (CN 02118792) in view of Roni (WO 01/35655).

Regarding claim 2, Jinsong discloses, the conference coordination system, a accomplishing configuration and operating management (Pg 11-13 the first top GK "which is reads on conference coordinating system", receive setup call signaling request, analyze the location signaling, decide if the signaling is to a second "neighbor" conference coordination system, accomplish a confirmation signaling) and processing the conference request (Pg.11-13, 25-27, 34 and 37), communicating with subordinate conference management systems and the neighboring conference coordination systems (Pg. 30) and forwarding conference location resources information (Pg. 37-38).

Jinsong does not explicitly teach modules for accomplishing the previous mentioned tasks.

Roni in similar art of endeavor discloses, a four layers videoconferencing system (Fig. 1) comprising: terminals (Fig. 1, el. 190, 195, 198), MCU (Fig. 1, el. 135, 140 and 145), conference management systems as the superior level for the multipoint control

Units (Fig. 1, el. 125), conference coordination systems, as the superior level for the conference management systems (Fig. 1, el. 110), Also see Pg. 8-9.

Roni also discloses, that the conference coordination system comprising several modules (Pg. 9-10), the modules include and not limited to , the conference reservation manager (reads on "system management module"; Fig. 2, el. 235), which for accomplishing system configuration and operating management of the conference coordination system (Pg. 9-10), and a conference dispatching modules for processing conference dispatching requests (Fig. 2, el. 20 and Pg. 10), a conference control module, for forwarding conference control data (Fig. 2, el. 245 and 255) and a communication module (Pg. 11 and Fig. 2, el. 260).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Jinsong with Roni teaching in order to maximize the functions of the conference coordination system and to obtain predictable results.

Regarding claim 3, Jinsong in view of Roni discloses, wherein the models between the conference coordination systems and the subordinate conference management systems as well as between the conference coordination systems are based on the International Telecommunications Union transport service ITU-T.H.323 (Pg. 24).

Jinsong in view of Roni does not discloses the international Organization for Standardization 7-layer model for communication, with the International

Telecommunications Union transport service ITU-T X.224 below the transport layer. However, using a protocol that suit the system needs and be compatible with it's functions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Jinsong in view of Roni so the models will be based on International Telecommunications Union transport service ITU-T X.224 below the transport layer in order to provide the connection mode transport service.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 4-13, 15-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARIA EL-ZOBI whose telephone number is (571)270-3434. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8AM-5 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 2614
/CURTIS KUNTZ/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614